



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,074	06/29/2000	John Christian Fluke	RAL9-1999-0133US1	7844

25299 7590 10/22/2003

IBM CORPORATION
PO BOX 12195
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/607,074

Applicant(s)

FLUKE ET AL.

Examiner

Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit

2122

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____


Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant's claim 1 recites the format argument of a print function being a pointer in an address space of the application; saving the format argument in a buffer, and processing the buffer to print a data argument. Claim 1 does NOT recite a specific use of the pointer, any transfer of the buffer data to a different machine, or even that the pointer necessarily be dereferenced at a later time. As asserted by the Examiner, Bugg teaches a format argument of a print function that is a pointer in the address space of the application. Further, as asserted by the Examiner, the purpose of the format pointer is to control the way in which a debug string is printed, transferred, or stored. The Examiner has asserted that the format pointer of Bugg is inherently dereferenced prior to printing, transferring, or storing. Thus, it is not necessary for the pointer to remain valid indefinitely but only long enough for printing, transferring, or storing to take place. The steps recited in claim 1 do not preclude this method of operation. Thus, employing the teachings of Bugg with the teachings of King does not require that a system have access to the specific address space indicated by the pointer, but only to the contents of that address space. The requirement is that the debugger print function use as at least one of its arguments, a pointer, which can be dereferenced from within the address space of the application. Thus, it is reasserted that the combination of King in view of Bugg, as relied upon by the Examiner, is not an inoperable system, and meets the invention recited in claim 1. In response to Applicant's arguments against the combination of King in view of Wygodny, the Examiner reasserts that in the system of Wygodny, the host processor has access to the client application address space. For example, in the advanced trace options, pointers can be selected, resulting in the a trace detail tree that can display a pointer value (address) and the value of a memory location to which a pointer points (see, for example, column 20, lines 1-26).



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER